

REMARKS

The Final Office Action of February 13, 2008 was received and carefully reviewed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the currently pending rejections are requested for the reasons advanced in detail below. By this amendment, claims 1, 2, 9, 10, and 17 are amended to further define the invention, and new claims 18-30 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-30 are currently pending in the instant application.

Applicants respectfully assert that support for new claims 18-30 may be found by the disclosed Embodiment Mode 1, as well as FIGs. 2A and 2B. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the present Amendment does not introduce new matter.

On pages 2 to 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. (US 2002/0132396) in view of Applicants' Disclosure (with regard to CN86103174). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1 and 2, as amended, both recite a liquid crystal display device including, in part, "a conductive layer over an insulating surface" and "a gate electrode formed on the conductive layer," wherein "a portion of the conductive layer which is not overlapped with the gate electrode is oxidized and insulated." Similarly, independent claims 9, 10, and 17, as amended, all recite a method for manufacturing a liquid crystal display device including, in part, steps of "forming a conductive layer over an insulating surface," "forming a gate electrode by selectively ejecting composition on the conductive layer," and "oxidizing a portion of the conductive layer which is not overlapped with the gate electrode."

In direct contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, Yamazaki et al. and CN86103174, whether taken singly or combined, fail to teach or suggest the structural features of amended independent claims 1 and 2, as well as the method of amended independent claims 9, 10, and 17. Specifically, neither Yamazaki et al. nor CN86103174, whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest a liquid crystal display device including "a conductive layer over an insulating surface" and "a gate electrode formed on the conductive layer," wherein "a portion of the conductive layer which is not overlapped with the gate electrode is oxidized and insulated," as required by amended independent claims 1 and 2. Likewise, neither Yamazaki et al. nor CN86103174, whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest a method for manufacturing a liquid crystal display device including, in part, steps of "forming

a conductive layer over an insulating surface,” “forming a gate electrode by selectively ejecting composition on the conductive layer,” and “oxidizing a portion of the conductive layer which is not overlapped with the gate electrode,” as required by amended independent claims 9, 10, and 17.

Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 1 and 2 recite additional structural features of the claimed “barrier film” that are clearly neither taught nor suggested by the prior art of record. Specifically, amended independent claims 1 and 2 now recite features of the claimed “barrier film,” as shown in FIGs. 9A-9C.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claim 17 recites additional steps of forming a first conductive film, a pattern of laminated films, and a second conductive film that are clearly neither taught nor suggested by the prior art of record. For example, as shown in FIG. 11A, the first conductive film 508 is formed by selectively ejecting composition, forming a pattern of laminated films 206/207/508 by using the first conductive film 508 as a first mask. In addition, FIG. 11C shows forming a second conductive film 514 so as to cover the laminated films 206/207/508.

Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the combined teachings of Yamazaki et al. and CN86103174 fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to amended independent claims 1, 2, 9, 10, and 17, and hence dependent claims 3-8, 11-16, 18-20, as well as new claims 21-30. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Yamazaki et al. and CN86103174 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the prior art rejection of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that all pending claims be indicated as allowable, and that the application be passed to issue.

If a conference would expedite prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,
NIXON PEABODY LLP

\David B. Hardy, Reg. No. 47,362\
David B. Hardy
Registration No. 47,362

Date: May 13, 2008

CUSTOMER NO. 22204
NIXON PEABODY LLP
Suite 900, 401 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000